

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 12/22/04, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-6, 9-16, 19 and 20 are still pending.

In the Office Action mailed 12/22/04, the Examiner has objected to the title for not being descriptive. Applicant is submitting a new title and requests the Examiner to accept the newly submitted title. Furthermore, a typographical error to a reference number on the drawing was noted on page 34 of the specification. An amended paragraph is being submitted herewith.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite in the claiming of the various floating point instructions. Applicant has amended claims 6 and 16 to claim just the multiply-add instruction. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-15, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Halfhill ("SiByte Reveals 64-Bit Core for NPUs") and further rejected claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Halfhill, in view of the IEEE Floating Point Standard. Applicant submits that Halfhill fails to disclose the elements of the pending claims, as amended.

The independent claims 1, 11 and 20 now clearly recite that if a second instruction to be issued to the second pipeline is a floating point instruction and the first instruction is subsequent to the second instruction in program order, the first instruction to be inhibited for a predetermined number of stage cycles until the first instruction is determined not to graduate from the first pipeline at least no earlier than the second instruction reaching a stage in the second pipeline where exceptions are to be generated to ensure that the first instruction does not graduate from the first pipeline prior to exception determination for the second instruction in the second pipeline.

Halfhill shows different pipelines and use of skew stages to allow a dependent instruction to follow a load without stalling, but Halfhill does not disclose the aspects of

the embodiments of the invention now claimed in the independent claims. The Examiner states in his argument that "the instructions must remain in-order from issue to completion ... [and] that would mean the issue logic has the ability to inhibit co-issuance of two instructions if the second instruction in program order depends on the first instruction in program order." However, this is an unsupported assertion made by the Examiner and no such description is present in Halfhill. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Halfhill fails to disclose the embodiments of the invention now claimed in the amended claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and allow pending claims 1-6, 9-16, 19 and 20, as amended.

Furthermore, Applicant has noted that the Examiner has acknowledged the Change in Power of Attorney received by the PTO on 10/16/03. However, the PTO has failed to note the change in address specified in the new Power of Attorney in mailing the subject office action. In order to ensure that the correct customer number is associated with this case, a change of correspondence address form is concurrently submitted with this response. Please effect the address change to customer number 34,399.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP
(Customer No. 34,399)

Date: 3-22-2005

By: William W. Kidd
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com